

REMARKS

This paper addresses the issues raised in the Advisory Action mailed July 28, 2004. Claims 1-19 are currently pending.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner continued his rejection of claims 1-19 and objected to claims 4, 8 and 12. The Examiner, however, indicated that dependent claims 4, 8 and 12 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form and included all intervening claims. In response thereto, Applicants have amended claims 1, 7 and 11 to incorporate claims 4, 8, and 12 respectively, and canceled Claims 4, 8 and 12. Applicants respectfully request entry of the above amendment, favorable consideration of the following remarks, and passage of the pending claims to allowance.

In paragraph 4 of the Advisory Action, the Examiner indicated that Claims 4, 8 and 12 would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely-filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claims. Claims 1, 7 and 11 have been amended to reflect this requirement as follows:

Claim 1, as amended, incorporates claim 4 and all intervening claims therein, i.e. claims 2 and 3;

Claim 7, as amended, incorporates claim 8;

Claim 11, as amended, incorporates claim 12;

Claims 2-4, 8 and 12 have been canceled;

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that above objections and rejections to the above claims be withdrawn and the remaining claims 1, 5-7, 9-11, and 13-19 be passed to allowance.

In paragraph 5 of the Advisory Action, the Examiner states that a skilled practitioner would not be enabled to select appropriate MOVs and thermal fuses because the drawing indicates that the thermal fuses are all fifteen ampere rated. Applicants respectfully assert that it is the teaching of the use of temperature-reactive fuses rather than current-reactive fuses that is enabling. Applicants respectfully further assert that a skilled practitioner may be expected to know how to select appropriate temperature-reactive components, once the concept is taught. As Applicants stated in the June 29, 2004, response to the April 30, 2004, Final Office Action, the ampere specification of a thermal fuse merely indicates the service range for the thermal

fuse, not the overload point. Thermal fuses respond to an over-temperature condition, not an over-current condition. The selection of appropriate thermal fuses having the desired temperature reaction point, and appropriate MOVs suitable for the expected service range of the inventive apparatus, so that at least the hot line is disconnected, and preferably both the hot line and the neutral line are sequentially disconnected, is most certainly within the capability and knowledge of a skilled practitioner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this objection be withdrawn and the remaining claims be passed to allowance.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1, 5-7, 9-11, and 13-19 are remaining, notwithstanding Applicants' belief that the claims were allowable as originally presented. Applicants believe the above claims are enabling and allowable. In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, favorable consideration by the Examiner, entry of the above amendment, withdrawal of the present objections and rejections, allowance of Claims 1, 5-7, 9-11, and 13-19, and passage of the present application to issuance are accordingly solicited. The Examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned for any reason which would advance the pending claims toward allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



C. Kelley Crossman
Reg. No. 34,312

CKC/sf

Dated: August 27, 2004

LARIVIERE, GRUBMAN & PAYNE, LLP
Post Office Box 3140
Monterey, CA 93942
(831) 649-8800